

G. Public Involvement

This section outlines the scoping and public participation program completed by the CSLC before issuance of the Draft EIR. In the Final EIR, this section will include copies of comments on the Draft EIR and responses to comments.

G.1 EIR Scoping Process

The scoping process for the Concord to Sacramento Pipeline Project EIR consisted of four elements, (each of which is described in more detail in the following sections):

1. A Notice of Preparation of an EIR (NOP) was published soliciting comments from affected public agencies, as required by CEQA, as well as from the public.
2. A public scoping meeting was held.
3. Scoping comments were received and summarized.
4. A Public Update was mailed in February 2003 to the original NOP mailing list and to 17 additional groups interested in Environmental Justice issues.

Notice of Preparation

The CSLC issued the NOP on February 1, 2002 and distributed it to the State Clearinghouse and city, county, state and federal agencies, affected state and federal legislators, and local elected officials. The NOP issuance was followed by the required 30-day comment period for interested parties to submit comments regarding the content of the EIR. There were approximately 47 copies of the NOP mailed out. A Public Update (described below) was mailed on February 7, 2003.

Public Update

In February 2003, the CSLC distributed an update on the Proposed Project and the CEQA process due to delays in the originally expected schedule for completion of this EIR. This update included a description of major project changes that had occurred since issuance of the NOP and a map of the proposed route and alternatives considered by SFPP. A copy of the NOP was not remailed with the Public Update. It was mailed to the original NOP mailing list, as well as to 17 additional groups interested in Environmental Justice issues.

Scoping Meeting

One public scoping meeting was conducted as part of the EIR scoping process to receive input regarding the scope and content of this EIR, as well as alternatives and mitigation measures which should be considered. This scoping meeting was held on February 20, 2002 at 7:00 pm at the City of Fairfield Senior Center Assembly Hall 1, Fairfield. There were approximately 15 attendees.

Prior to the scoping meeting, advertisements were published in five newspapers within the project area, including:

- Dixon Tribune
- Sacramento Bee
- Contra Costa Times
- Daily Republic (Fairfield)
- Davis Enterprise

Summary of Scoping Comments

Table G-1 lists the agencies that submitted comments in response to the NOP or the Public Update, and gives a brief description of their key issues and concerns regarding the Proposed Project. This summary and the scoping comments were distributed as appropriate to the EIR team members for use in work planning and impact analysis.

Table G-1 Commenters and Key Issues

Commenter	Key Issue(s)	Location of Response in EIR
Napa-Solano Counties Building and Construction Trades Council - Lou Franchimon, Business Manager	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requested detailed review of the safety features for the proposed pipeline project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section B.5 (Project Description, Operations and Maintenance) and Section D.2 (Pipeline Safety and Risk of Accidents)
Napa-Solano Counties Building and Construction Trades Council - Roger Wilson, District Representative of the Operating Engineers Local 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requested analysis of the potential risk to public and environmental safety posed by transporting petroleum products by pipeline, versus tanker truck, train, or ship. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section C.3.3 (Alternatives, No Project Alternative) and Section D.2 (Pipeline Safety and Risk of Accidents)
Napa-Solano Counties Building and Construction Trades Council - Tammy Castillo, Apprenticeship Coordinator for the Operating Engineers Local 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requested detailed review of the safety features that will be incorporated into the proposed pipeline project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section B.5 (Project Description, Operations and Maintenance) and Section D.2 (Pipeline Safety and Risk of Accidents)
Hod Carriers and General Laborers No.326 of the Laborers' International Union of North America Ron Puls, Business Manager	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requested analysis of the potential risk to public and environmental safety posed by transporting petroleum. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section B.5 (Project Description, Operations and Maintenance) and Section D.2 (Pipeline Safety and Risk of Accidents)
CA Department of Transportation Dist. 3- Office of Regional Planning - Jeffrey Pulverman, Chief	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted that if the pipeline is proposed within the State right of way, longitudinal encroachments within access-controlled right of ways are not allowed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section A.1 (Introduction, Agency Use of this Document)
CA Department of Water Resources-Floodway Protection Section - Michalyn Green	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted that the proposed project will require a State Reclamation Board permit. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section A.1 (Introduction, Agency Use of this Document)
Paleo Resource Consultants-F&F Georesource Assoc. - Lanny Fisk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requested appropriate survey and analysis of potential impacts and subsequent mitigation measures to paleontological resources identified within the DEIR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section D.7 (Geology, Soils & Paleontology), Section F (Mitigation Monitoring)
Solano County Transportation Department Gary Crawford, Survey and Land Supervisor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about transportation/traffic impacts and analysis and damage to roads. Noted that county roads have a limited ability to handle heavy construction equipment (narrow road widths, lack of shoulders, thin structural section). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section D.12 (Transportation and Traffic)
City of Fairfield, Public Works Department Charles Beck, Director	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted that will not be able to comment on March 6, 2002. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
County of Yolo - Planning and Public Works Department - David Morrison, Asst. Director	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted that routes outside of any State or local rights-of-way require a Conditional Use Permit by the County. Commented that the CUP process takes approximately six to nine months. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section A.1 (Introduction, Agency Use of this Document)

Table G-1 Commenters and Key Issues

Commenter	Key Issue(s)	Location of Response in EIR
CA Department of Fish and Game Dr. Larry L. Eng, Ph.D., Asst. Regional Manager	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requested analysis of reasonably foreseeable direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts on biological resources. • Commented that habitat areas should be quantified and delineated on maps to illustrate the project impacts. • Requested analysis of impacts on rare, threatened or endangered species (CDFG and USFWS lists). Full biotic lists should be included in the Appendices of the DEIR. • Requested analysis of impacts on significant habitats, wetlands, and riparian areas. Mitigation should be based on "no-net-loss." • Requested analysis of habitat fragmentation, population isolation, and decreased habitat connectivity. • Requested mitigation measures to address all reasonably foreseeable project related impacts on biological resources. • Commented that the project should comply with applicable local and regional land use plans (General Plans, Watershed Plans, Habitat Conservation Plans, and USFWS Biological Opinions). • Requested analysis of alternatives that will avoid or substantially lessen project-related impacts on biological resources. • Noted the CDFG Regulations 1600 et seq. (minimum vegetation removal, protection of fish and wildlife resources at risk, delineation of buffers, prevention of runoff into a stream or lake, prevention of downstream sedimentation and pollution, and performance standards on types of vegetation to be used, timing of implementation, contingency plans if replanting is unsuccessful, use of native vegetation). 	Section A.1 (Introduction, Agency Use of this Document), Section C (Alternatives), Section D.4 and Appendix 1 (Biological Resources), Section D.9 (Land Use, Public Recreation, and Special Interest Areas), Section F (Mitigation Monitoring)
City of Suisun City Public Works Department William Duncan, Director	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requested the analysis of an alignment adjacent to the existing pipeline. • Requested analysis of wetlands issues within the City limits. • Requested that the EIR address socio-economic impact on businesses during construction. 	Section C (Alternatives), Section D.4 and Appendix 1 (Biological Resources), Section D.8 (Hydrology and Water Quality). Socioeconomic impacts are not addressed in the EIR
Department of Transportation, District 04 Jean C. R. Finney, District Branch Chief	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requested precise locations for crossings of State Route 12, I- 80 and other State roadways and if each is a crossing or a ROW alignment. • Noted that project should adhere to NPDES GP CA S000002, Order No. 99-08-DWQ. • Noted that the project will need a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan. • Noted that work within the ROW may require an encroachment permit. 	Section A.1 (Introduction, Agency Use of this Document), Section D.8 (Hydrology and Water Quality), Section D.12 (Transportation and Traffic)
City of Fairfield - Charles J. Beck, Director of Public Works	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted that the pipeline may conflict with a proposed development plan for undeveloped property from Peabody Road onto Markley Lane. 	Cumulative impacts are addressed under each issue area in Section D, Section E (Other CEQA Considerations)
Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted that significant air quality impacts within the District are determined when they exceed 82 pounds per day of ROG, NOx or PM₁₀ from construction or operation. Potential impacts within 10% of exceedance will require emission forecasting. • Provided a table showing predictive dust emissions reductions through mitigation for PM₁₀. 	Section D.3 (Air Quality)

Table G-1 Commenters and Key Issues

Commenter	Key Issue(s)	Location of Response in EIR
County of Yolo – Planning and Public Works Department - Sarjit S. Dhaliwal, Associate Planner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted concern about impacts on agricultural lands, wildlife habitat, cultural resources, exposure of people, wildlife and natural resources to emergency/upset conditions due to pipeline rupture, explosion; and growth-inducing impacts. Provided clarification concerning the County's code with respect to public utility projects and the necessity to obtain a County Use Permit crossing private lands in the County. 	Section A.1 (Introduction, Agency Use of this Document), Section D.2 (Pipeline Safety and Risk of Accidents), Section D.4 (Biological Resources), Section D.5 (Cultural Resources), Section D.9 (Land Use, Public Recreation, and Special Interest Areas), Section E (Other CEQA Considerations)
* Delta Protection Commission - Margit Aramburu, Executive Director	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted that the proposed route crosses through the Primary Zone of the Legal Delta. Stated the policy of the Utilities and Infrastructure section of the Commission's Land Use and Resource Management Plan for the Primary Zone of the Delta. Suggested consideration mitigation measures similar to pipeline proposals previously considered by the DPC. Suggested continued coordination with the Yolo Bypass Working Group 	Section A.1 (Introduction, Agency Use of this Document), Section D.4 (Biological Resources), Section D.8 (Hydrology and Water Quality), Section F (Mitigation Monitoring)
* Department of Water Resources - Sterling Sorenson, Water Resources Engineering Associate, Floodway Protection Section	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commented that portions of the project are within Putah Creek and Yolo Bypass, adopted plans of flood control, over which the Reclamation Board has jurisdiction. Noted that a Board permit will be required pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Title 23, Waters, Article 3 and described some of the Board's application requirements. 	Section A.1 (Introduction, Agency Use of this Document), Section D.4 (Biological Resources), Section D.8 (Hydrology and Water Quality)

* Indicates comments received following the February 2003 Project Update and NOP mailing

G.2 Public Involvement After Release of Draft EIR

A Notice of Release of the Draft EIR will be sent to property owners and occupants on or adjacent to SFPP's proposed route. The Notice will summarize the conclusions of the Draft EIR and will include information on how to access the Draft EIR. It will also present the date, time, and location of the public hearing on the Draft EIR.

Public Hearing

Following the release of the Draft EIR, there will be a 45-day public review period. Before the end of this comment period, one Public Hearing will be held, at the same location as the earlier Scoping Meeting (Fairfield). At this hearing, the public may ask questions about the EIR and its contents and present oral and/or written testimony on SFPP's application as well as the Draft EIR and its contents. The CSLC's decision-making process will also be explained at the Public Hearing.

EIR Information and Repository Sites

Placing CEQA documents in "repository" sites can be an effective way of providing ongoing information about the project to a large number of people. Therefore, six repository sites in the Proposed Project area were established, and documents are also available at the CSLC in Sacramento. EIR-related documents and the Draft EIR have been made available upon their release to the public at the locations listed below.

Benicia Public Library
150 E. L Street
Benicia, CA 94510-3281
(707) 746-4343

Fairfield-Suisun Community Library
1150 Kentucky Street
Fairfield, CA 94533-5799
(707) 421-6500

A.F. Turner Branch Library
1212 Merkley Avenue
West Sacramento, CA 95691-2792
(916) 375-6465

Concord Library
2900 Salvio Street
Concord, CA 94519-2597
(925) 646-5455

Suisun City Library
333 Sunset, Suite 280
Suisun City, CA 94585-2048
(707) 421-6937

CSLC Central Files
100 Howe Street, Suite 100 South
Sacramento, CA 95825
(916) 574-1900

Public Review Period

In compliance with CEQA Guidelines, the CSLC provides a public review period of 45 days for the Draft EIR. This public review period commences upon release of the Draft EIR. Written comments on the Draft EIR may be submitted at the Public Hearing, via facsimile transmission to (916) 574-1885, or in person to the CSLC Central Files office in Sacramento (address above). Comments may also be submitted via email or by U.S. mail to the following addresses:

Judy Brown
California State Lands Commission
100 Howe Avenue, Suite 100 South
Sacramento, CA 95825
email: BROWNJ@slc.ca.gov

Written comments must be received or postmarked by the end of the comment period. Please remember to include your name and return address in your written comments. Oral comments will only be received at the CSLC's Public Hearing.